THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.1275 OF 2006

DATED:25.1.2006

Between:

Talluri Narasimhamurthy

…Petitioner

And

The Municipal Corporation of Kakinada

Rep. by its Commissioner,

Kakinada, and another

…Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.1275 OF 2006

ORDER:

The petitioner is allegedly owner of premises bearing D.No.45-1-13, Main Road, Jagannaickpur, Kakinada. It is alleged that recently the officials of the Kakinada Municipal Corporation (KMC) came to the petitioner's premises and marked certain portion of the premises for demolition for widening the Road. The petitioner is not willing to give consent to handover possession. The petitioner alleges that the action of the respondents in proposing to demolish his premises without following due process is illegal and arbitrary.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for KMC. After getting instructions in the matter, the learned Standing Counsel for KMC

submits that if the petitioner is not willing to give his consent, necessary action would be taken in accordance with Section 147 of the Hyderabad Municipal Corporation Act, 1955 (the HMC Act, for short) for acquiring the land. The learned Counsel does not dispute that unless the petitioner is deprived of his property in accordance with due process of law, his right to enjoy the property cannot be denied.

This Court in **P.Lakshmana Rao v. Executive Officer** and **M.Madhavi Latha v. Rajendranagar Municipality** and **Srichand Rohra v. Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad** has held that whenever a private property is required for laying road, widening existing road or for any public purpose, public authorities - be it local body, Corporation or Government - cannot highhandedly dispossess the petitioner or owners of the land. They have to necessarily follow the procedure either by negotiating with the owners or acquiring the land as per Section 147 of the HMC Act in case the owners are not inclined to give willingness to part with the land voluntarily. The respondent authorities cannot high-handedly take coercive action against petitioner.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of observing that unless and until requisite proceedings under Section 147 of the Act are initiated, the petitioner's right to enjoy his property cannot be denied nor KMC officials can demolish premises of the petitioner, without notice.

The Writ Petition, with the above observations and directions, is disposed of. No costs.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO, J)

25.1.2006

bnr